



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,125	08/05/2003	Kazunobu Okazaki	Q76820	5755
23373	7590	02/06/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			QAZL SABHA NAJM	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1612	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/06/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/634,125	Applicant(s) OKAZAKI ET AL.
	Examiner Sabiha Gazi	Art Unit 1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11,13,15,18 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 10,12,14,16,17 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 11, 13, 15, 18, and 19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2003 and 2/5/04 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date 4/9/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 10-20 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time. Amendments are entered.

Summary of this Office Action dated Saturday, January 03, 2009

1. Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114
2. Information Disclosure Statement
3. Copending Applications
4. Specification
5. Double Patenting Rejection
6. 35 USC § 103 Rejection
7. Response to Remarks
8. Communication

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/17/08 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are

"material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting Rejection

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

1. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 20 provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-4 of copending Application No. 10/525,385. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims of both applications are drawn to gel composition containing the same components.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the

time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DAVENPORT et al. (J. Dairy Sci. 83:2819; 892 references), EMOTO, MITSUO (US Patent 6,458, 395). The references teach a composition and process of making a nutritional supplement using whey protein, hydrogenated soybean, organic acid vitamin D and various other ingredients, which embraces presently claimed invention.

DAVENPORT teaches use of colostrum supplement with whey protein concentrate or casein. It further teaches that plasma volume expands with colostrum intake (see the entire document especially abstract, first para in column 2 on page 2815 and table 1 on page 2816).

Colostrum is breast milk so it contains natural calcium, carbohydrates, fat and water.

EMOTO teaches when specific amounts of lipid, saccharide, organic acid, organic acid salt, emulsifying agent and gelling agent are added to a protein so as

to obtain an emulsion having an acidic pH equal or close to the isoelectric point of the protein, a composite of an isoelectric gel of the protein and a gel formed with the gelling agent is obtained, which is soft and homogeneous and capable of being swallowed without chewing..

The reference teaches a gel of an emulsified mixture comprising 10 to 50 wt. % of the combined amount of the ingredients listed below (on a dry weight basis) and 50 to 90 wt. % of water, and which has a **pH of 3.3 to 4**, and which is a composite of an isoelectric gel of the protein and a heat-soluble gel formed with the gelling agent. good storage stability because of its pH of 3.3 to 4, preferably 3.5 to 4. Moreover, in spite of the acidic pH, the food product of the invention is free from grains of **coagulated protein**, and has smoothness and homogeneity that impart good eating qualities and textural properties to the food product.

The ingredients and proportions of the gelatinous food product of the invention are described in the references.

The gelatinous food product of the invention has good eating qualities and can be safely eaten by patients with dysphagia associated with various diseases or following surgical operations, the food product being capable of supplying well balanced nutrition. Further, the food product of the invention

is suitable for not only the patients but also healthy people, for example,
athletes who need to obtain nutrition quickly during training or competition.

The protein, one of the essential ingredients of the gelatinous food product of the invention, is selected from ones conventionally used in the field of food products. It is necessary that the protein form an isoelectric gel at the pH of the food product of the invention, i.e., pH 3.3 to 4. Examples of such proteins include gelatin, casein, whey proteins (e.g., lactalbumin), soybean protein and wheat protein; salts of these proteins; decomposition products (acid decomposition products and enzyme decomposition products) of these proteins; extracts of these proteins; concentrates of these proteins; and whole milk powders and skimmed milk powders. The proteins may be used singly or in combination.

The protein is present in the food product of the invention in a proportion of about 2 to 60%, preferably about 10 to 45%, more preferably about 15 to 30% on a dry weight basis. Proportions less than 2% or more than 30% are not preferable, since the resulting food product does not satisfy the requirements for nutritionally balanced food products.

The reference also teaches organic acids and vitamins including vitamin D as ingredients (lines 1-20 and 55-68 in column 5, lines 1-12 in column 6). See examples and claims.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to prepare a nutritional supplement containing a protein which does not coagulate at 3.3 to PH 4 (whey protein, as in the disclosure of the present invention and colostrum) and vitamin D and other ingredients in the form of a gel because prior art teaches the nutritional supplement and process of making them in the form of a gel. One skilled in the art would know that calcium is natural from acids, carbohydrates, fat and water all are present in milk which expands plasma volume. One skilled in the art would also know to add emulsifying agent and agar because prior art also teaches the use of these components. Motivation has been provided by the reference. Since no new concept and/or improvement were noted therefore presently claimed invention has been considered obvious over the prior art of record.

The proportions and percentage are taught by the references. Even if these were not in the ranges court has decided that normally, change in temperature, concentration, or both, is not a patentable modification; however, such changes

may impart patentability to a process if the ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from results of prior art; such ranges are termed "critical" ranges, and applicant has burden of proving such criticality; even though applicant's modification results in great improvement and utility over prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art; more particularly, where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. In re Aller et al. 105 USPQ 233. The formulation as gel would have been obvious to one who is familiar with the art.

It is well established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. In re Becket, 33 U.S.P.Q. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

Since no criticality and/or unexpected results are seen presently claimed invention is considered obvious over the prior art of record.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Remarks

Applicant's election of group I, claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 20 with traverse is hereby acknowledged. Applicant argues that since both groups I and II are drawn to method of increasing the plasma volume therefore, no restriction should have been made. Restriction was made because both the methods as claimed are considered different. Claims of group I are drawn to a gel composition which can be used topically wherein invention of group II is drawn to a composition containing food. One reference may not be applicable to both the methods. Examiner will withdraw the restriction requirement if Applicants on record agree that when any reference used to reject one method can be used for the other and therefore there is no difference.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/634,125
Art Unit: 1612

Page 14

/Sabiha Qazi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612